

Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia County
Trial Division - Civil
TRIAL WORK SHEET


Judge's Name:

DANIEL J ANDERS

Judge's I.D.:

J461

Signature:



Caption:

MESIGIAN ETAL VS ETHICON WOMEN'S
HEALTH AND UROLOG

Case Type:

MT - PELVIC MESH

Program:

MASS TORT

Court Term and Number:

If Consolidated, Court Term and Number:

#1402-00399

Trial Date:

04-APR-2019

☒ Jury

Non-Jury

Total Amount:

\$80,025,000.00

Number of
Days:

37

Disposition
Date:

17-MAY-2019

Date Sheet
Prepared:

17-MAY-2019

Full Description of Disposition (to be entered Verbatim on the Docket)

The jury returned a verdict (1) in favor of Plaintiff Patricia Mesigian and against the Defendants for \$30,000,000 in compensatory damages and \$50,000,000 in punitive damages and (2) in favor of Plaintiff George Mesigian and against the Defendants for \$25,000.

☐ Default Judgment/Court Ordered

☐ Directed Verdict

☐ Discontinuance Ordered

☐ Transferred to binding
arbitration

☐ Finding for Defendant (Non-Jury)

☐ Finding for Plaintiff (Non-Jury)

☐ Damages Assessed

☐ Judgment entered by agreement

☐ Judgment entered

☐ Judgment satisfied

☒ Jury Verdict for Plaintiff

☐ Jury Verdict for Defendant

☐ Mistrial

☐ Hung Jury

☐ Non-Pros entered

☐ Non-Suit entered

☐ Settled prior to assignment
for trial (Team Leaders, only)

☐ Settled after assignment
for trial

☐ prior to jury selection

☐ after jury sworn

☐ Other (explain)

Mesigian Etal Vs Ethico-WSJVP



14020039900304

**DOCKETED
COMPLEX LIT CENTER**

MAY 20 2019

J. STEWART

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF PHILADELPHIA COUNTY
FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA
TRIAL DIVISION - CIVIL

PATRICIA MESIGIAN and GEORGE : Case No. 140200399
MESIGIAN :
vs. :
ETHICON INC. and JOHNSON & JOHNSON :
:

VERDICT SHEET

QUESTION #1:

Did Plaintiff Patricia Mesigian file her lawsuit within the statute of limitations?

YES ☒ NO ☐

If you answer "Yes" to Question 1, please proceed to Question 2.

If you answer "No" to Question 1, please sign and date the form and return to the courtroom.

QUESTION #2:

Do you find that Plaintiff Patricia Mesigian proved that the Prolift was defective under the "Consumer Expectations" test?

YES ☒ NO ☐

If you answer "Yes" to Question 2, please proceed to Question 3.

If you answer "No" to Question 2, please proceed to Question 4.

QUESTION #3:

Was the defect you found in the Prolift under the "Consumer Expectations" test a factual cause of Plaintiff Patricia Mesigian's harm?

YES ☒ NO ☐

If you answer "Yes" to Question 3, please proceed to Question 4.

If you answer "No" to Question 3, please proceed to Question 4.

QUESTION #4:

Do you find that Plaintiff Patricia Mesigian proved that the Prolift was defective under the "Risk/Utility" test?

YES ☒ NO ☐

If you answer "Yes" to Question 4, please proceed to Question 5.

If you answer "No" to Question 4, please proceed to Question 6.

QUESTION #5:

Was the defect you found in the Prolift under the "Risk/Utility" test a factual cause of Plaintiff Patricia Mesigian's harm?

YES ✓ NO

Please proceed to Question 6.

QUESTION #6:

Do you find that Plaintiff Patricia Mesigian proved that Defendants failed to adequately warn about the risks of the Prolift?

YES ✓ NO

If you answer "Yes" to Question 6, please proceed to Question 7.
If you answer "No" to Question 6 but answered "Yes" to either Question 3 or 5, please proceed to Question 8.
If you answer "No" to Question 6 and answered "No" to Question 3 and 5, please sign and date the form and return to the courtroom.

QUESTION #7:

Do you find that Defendants' failure to adequately warn about the risks of the Prolift was a factual cause of Plaintiff Patricia Mesigian's harm?

YES ✓ NO

If you answer "Yes" to Question 7, please proceed to Question 8.
If you answer "No" to Question 7, but answered "Yes" to either Question 3 or 5, please proceed to Question 8.
If you answer "No" to Question 7 and answered "No" to Questions 3 and 5, please sign and date the form and return to the courtroom.

QUESTION #8

State the total amount of compensatory damages sustained by Plaintiff Patricia Mesigian as a result of the defects and/or Defendants' failure to warn that you found.

\$ 30 million

Please proceed to Question 9.

QUESTION #9:

Do you find that Plaintiff George Mesigian proved that he suffered a loss of consortium?

YES ✓ NO

If you answer "Yes" to Question 9, please proceed to Question 10.

If you answer "No" to Question 9, please proceed to Question 11.

QUESTION #10

State the total amount of compensatory damages, if any, sustained by Plaintiff George Mesigian as a result of the loss of consortium.

\$ 25, thousand

Please proceed to Question 11.

QUESTION #11:

Based upon the instruction given to you by the Court, do you find that punitive damages should be awarded?

YES ✓ NO

If you answer "Yes" to Question 11, please proceed to Question 12.

If you answer "No" to Question 11, please sign and date the form and return to the courtroom.

QUESTION #12

State the amount of punitive damages that you award.

\$ 50 million

Final Instructions

Please note that at least 10 of 12 jurors must agree with the answer to each question on this Verdict Sheet. They do not need to be the same 10 of 12 jurors for each question.

TAWANDA INGRAM
JURY FOREPERSON

Date: 5-17-19